

contribution to a bank PAC, or let us say that you are an individual who makes a contribution to a particular other PAC, what happens is that the character of that contribution changes from being complex and subtle and intelligent to being stupid and narrow and ugly, with only one or two specific political agendas for that term of Congress.

ADMINISTRATION SHOULD ADVISE CONGRESS REGARDING CURRENT HAITI SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the 5 minutes. Mr. Speaker, I took the well last evening because we had received a surprise from Haiti. We were getting ground reports that the 82d Airborne had arrived in that country, at least in company strength, and was very visible on Humvee vehicles with machine guns and battle gear going around the capital city and elsewhere in the country.

The people were puzzled about what was going on, so we asked for an explanation from the administration. Today is another day and today is another day we have had more silence from the administration on exactly what are our increased American troops doing in Haiti and what, in fact, is going on in Haiti.

Many people who do not follow what goes on in that friendly neighboring country just to the south of Florida, which is my district, are not aware that they have just had the equivalent of their O.J. Simpson trial there over the death of a respected man named Guy Mallory who was assassinated a few years ago, among many assassinations that have regrettably taken place in that country. That trial came out that they acquitted two suspects that they felt they had pretty good evidence. And now the President of the country has come along and said there was something, quote, suspicious about the verdict.

The judicial system does not work very well in Haiti. It is a country where passions tend to run very quickly and very intensely. We have now got people in the streets saying that this jury contained people who were enemies of the people. "Enemies of the people" in Haiti is code word and it usually precursus trouble.

We have got now a situation where we have got obviously a bad situation in the country and a lot of agitation and feeling going on. And apparently we have now sent the 82d Airborne, at least part of it. We do not know exactly what they are doing. We do not send the 82d Airborne just anywhere. They are a crack American outfit. We reserve them for our most difficult problems and hot spots. I would suggest that Bujumbura, Burundi, today is a place where the human rights viola-

tions and the black-on-black genocide is so atrocious that if there were a need to put our troops some place to make peace and stability and protect human rights, it might rise to a larger order of things to be looking at Bujumbura than Haiti.

But some have suggested that the reason that we have sent the 82d to Haiti is to perhaps try to keep the lid on things there because we know that the Clinton administration has claimed Haiti as a foreign policy success story, and I know that they are anxious to try and keep proving that right up to the election, at least in this country.

I think that the time has come for the Clinton administration to try and reduce the candor gap with the American people on so many issues. But when it comes to foreign policy and when it comes to committing our troops who are actually in harm's way in a situation as explosive as the one in Port-au-Prince and Haiti today, it seems that they ought to be discussing it with Members of Congress who have legitimate oversight and legitimate concerns about how our taxpayers' dollars are spent, and legitimate concerns about how our foreign policy is executed and when it is executed.

So I am still hopeful that the administration will take advantage of this and the White House will share with the American people and the news networks what exactly is going on in Haiti and why we have more soldiers there.

WHO REALLY SPEAKS FOR THE CHILDREN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today I want to spend just a few minutes on a subject that is very important to me that is the subject of children.

I have four children and, as luck would have it, I have one of them here on the floor with me today. My 10-year-old daughter Emily is visiting Washington, DC, with me this week, and she has a 12-year-old sister, a 7-year-old sister and a 4-year-old brother, in our household children are very important. I hope they are very important to every Member of this body because just about everything we do here will have an impact on our country's children.

Mr. Speaker, I am new to this body. I have been here only a year and a half, but I have noticed there is a significant difference between our two parties when we talk about children.

The Democrats tend to talk about Government programs, Government spending, and Government bureaucrats, and I recognize that is an approach that they have taken. They think that is what it takes to raise a child, and I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I disagree.

We have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars over the last 30

years on Government run welfare, and our problems have only gotten worse. I think it is time for Republicans and Democrats to call for a new approach or, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is a very old approach. This approach is called responsible parents. That is what it takes to raise a child in America today, responsible parents.

We should not be asking ourselves what should the Government do for children. What we should be asking is how can we help parents do more for their children? What children need is not more Government spending, it is compassion. It is help from their parents. That is something the Government cannot provide.

When we talk about children, Republicans begin with three principles: First, that the moral health of our Nation is at least as important as the economic health or the military health of our country. The fact is you cannot raise children in the proper environment when 12-year-olds are having babies, 15-year-olds are killing each other, 17-year-olds are dying of AIDS and 18-year-olds are graduating with diplomas that they cannot read. If we are going to take care of our children, we have to restore the moral health of our country.

Second, it is results, not rhetoric, that count. Anyone can sound compassionate. Anyone can say what people want to hear. But we have got to go out there and do things that will actually help our children.

Third, we really have to look ourselves in the mirror and admit to ourselves and to the American people that the system we have in place right now is a failure. We have spent billions and billions of dollars over the past 30 years on a system that has not worked, and it is time to try something new.

Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago the Government started out with the best intentions but instead of solving the problem the Government created a welfare trap in this country. We have trapped a generation of Americans on Government assistance. We have deprived them of hope, of opportunity, and in many cases we have destroyed the lives of many precious children.

Take a look at what is happening in our cities. You will see a generation that is fed on food stamps, but starved on nurturing and hope and parental care. You will see second graders who do not know their ABC's, fourth graders who cannot add or subtract. You will see sixth graders who do not know the number of inches in a foot because they have never seen a ruler.

Yet every year, as we have done for the past 30 years, the Government spends more money on programs because it thinks that is the compassionate way to help people. Instead of helping people, Government in expanding the welfare trap from one community to another, from one child to another, from one generation to another. The welfare trap and Government spending makes us think we have done

something, makes us feel good about ourselves, when really we have not even begun to solve the problem.

As I say, the Government bureaucracy is well-intentioned, but what Government has failed to understand is that raising more taxes to hire more bureaucrats to expand a welfare system that does not work is only going to make matters worse. We have got to try a different approach.

The fact is welfare is not the only problem that is affecting our children. We recently passed a welfare reform bill in this House that takes a new approach and maybe that will have some positive affects. We need a new approach because at the start of this decade we had the most murders, the worst schools, the most abortions, the highest infant mortality rate, the most illegitimacy, the most one-parent families, the most children in jail, and the most children on Government aid in the world.

We are first only in the numbers of lawyers and lawsuits. That is the situation that has to change. The fact is a government-based policy to help children just does not work. It tends to destroy them, as we have seen over the past 30 years. It does not keep families together. It tends to drive them apart and instead of turning our cities into shining cities on the hill, it has made them into war zones where no one dares to go out at night and sometimes they do not dare to go out in the daytime as well.

So let me describe two competing visions of how we take care of our children in this country. There is the Government-based vision that we have talked about, but there is also a family based vision where parents like me, and like all of us who have children, are empowered to make decisions, where communities can decide for themselves how to fight crime and drugs and educate their children and where local school officials are given the ability to develop a curriculum that fits the needs of their students. That is the sort of approach we need to take.

Too often politicians use children as props. We should use them instead as a reminder that we have got a responsibility to the next generation. We need to help them with compassion and nurturing, not with Government handouts.

Too often politicians simply talk the talk because that is the easy way. It is easy to sound compassionate. But we need to work to reform the system that currently has failed our children, and I think that work begins with reforming welfare.

Let me state this clearly so there is no confusion. We have spent \$5 trillion since the mid-sixties on Government run welfare programs and yet we have more poverty, more crime, more drug addiction, more broken families, and more immoral behavior today than we had at that time. The Government system is broken. It does not work. It needs to be shut down, period.

But we have some alternatives. We have some things that might actually work, and let me give a couple of examples. Why does Habitat for Humanity work? It works because it requires recipients to do their own work, to learn the lessons themselves. Why does Earning for Learning work? It works because it pays young children to read. It educates many more than the Department of Education can ever do.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, our children are the future of our country. They are something we have to take very, very seriously. It is not enough to say that we care and not do the work to fix the system so it really does take care of our children.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gallery will maintain order. Under the rules of the House, expressions of approbation or disapprobation are not in order.

EFFECT OF WELFARE SYSTEM ON OUR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to pursue the discussion that my freshman colleague from Washington [Mr. WHITE] has been talking about. His daughter Emily reminds me a lot of my daughter Emily, who is now 16 years old, and we are having driving lessons. But I want to talk about children in America as well, and I want to talk about the welfare system and what we are doing to children.

Is there anything more cruel to children than consigning them to a lifetime of poverty and dependency? Cannot we do better than the welfare system we have in place now?

Almost everyone agrees that the welfare system has failed. It needs to be replaced. That is why I am encouraged that the House and the Senate have passed welfare reform legislation in the last couple of weeks on a bipartisan basis. This legislation will soon go to the President for his signature.

The war on poverty was begun in the mid-1960's with good intentions. President Lyndon Johnson and others argued that America needed to provide a nationwide safety net to catch those who had fallen on hard time. Some have said that the safety net has become a hammock, but that is not quite fair. In some respects it is more like a gill net, trapping and inflicting damage upon generations of Americans, and one does not have to look far to see its victims.

Out inner cities have become war zones. Out-of-wedlock births have quadrupled in the last 30 years, spawning a generation of fatherless young

men and women perpetuating a cycle of illegitimacy, violence, dependency, and despair.

□ 1345

Most Americans now see that the basic flaw with our war on poverty is that it has created a culture of entitlement to benefits through a Washington-dictated, one-size-fits-all system. It set up the wrong kinds of incentives, paying people not to work and penalizing them if they do. It hurts the very people it was designed to help. We are literally killing people with kindness.

Almost no one disagrees that we need fundamental change in our welfare policy. The administration boasts that it has approved a record number of waivers of Federal regulations to allow States to experiment with welfare reform. But that just shows how excessively bureaucratic and tangled the current system is.

For example, the President went out to Wisconsin and he praised the Wisconsin Works welfare reform plan, but the United States Department of Health and Human Services has not yet approved the waivers that would let the plan go forward.

Any reform plan must emphasize work and personal responsibility. The House-passed welfare reform plan will greatly increase States' abilities to design their own solutions aimed at moving people from dependency to work. It combines four Federal poverty programs, including Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the WIC nutrition program and child care, into block grants that give States flexibility to use scarce resources more efficiently. The House bill limits able-bodied adults to 2 years of assistance without work. With a lifetime maximum of 5 years of benefits, States could still grant hardship exceptions to 20 percent of their case load.

It requires people that bring immigrants into our country to live up to their sponsorship support commitments instead of passing them off to the taxpayers. And speaking of living up to their responsibilities, it also creates a nationwide tracking system for enforcing child support payments from deadbeat dads. It only makes common sense to require people to develop habits for working to support themselves. Work is more than the way you earn a living. It helps to define your very life. The great majority of Americans do it every day.

This is common sense. It is a consensus about both the need and the direction we should take in terms of welfare reform and has moved us to a truly historic opportunity to replace the faulty foundation of the welfare state.

The Senate bill, which passed on a bipartisan basis of 74 to 24, had almost all of the Republicans supporting it and over half of the Democrats. The House and Senate are resolving differences between the two bills, and we are hopeful that we can have a bill on the President's desk for his signature